RTI Essential Components Integrity Rubric

The RTI Essential Components Integrity Rubric is for use by individuals who are responsible for monitoring school-level fidelity of RTI implementation. The rubric is aligned with *Essential Components of RTI: A Closer Look at Response to Intervention* (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010).

Item	1	3	5
Screening—*The RTI framework accurately identifies students at risk of poor learning outcomes or challenging behaviors.*			
Screening Tools	Insufficient evidence that the screening tools are reliable; or that correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong; or that predictions of risk status are accurate.	Evidence indicates that the screening tools are reliable and that correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong. However, there is insufficient evidence that predictions of risk status are accurate.	Evidence indicates that the screening tools are reliable, correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong, and predictions of risk status are accurate.
Universal Screening	Neither condition is met: (1) Screening is conducted for all students (i.e., is universal); (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., all students are tested; scores are accurate; cut points/decisions are accurate).	Only one condition is met: (1) Screening is conducted for all students (i.e., is universal); (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., all students are tested; scores are accurate; cut points/decisions are accurate).	Both conditions are met: (1) Screening is conducted for all students (i.e., is universal); (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., all students are tested; scores are accurate; cut points/decisions are accurate).

Item	1	3	5
Multi-level Prevention/Intervention System—*The framework includes a school-wide, multi-level system for preventing school failure.*			
Primary Level Prevention/Core Curriculum			
Research-Based Curriculum Materials	The core curriculum materials are largely not research-based for the target population of learners (including sub-groups).	Some of the core curriculum materials are research-based for the target population of learners (including sub-groups).	All of the core curriculum materials are research-based for the target population of learners (including sub-groups).
Fidelity	Neither condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of the core curriculum; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity (i.e., the teacher rarely deviates from the materials or vendor-recommended activities, such as lesson content or pacing).	One condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of the core curriculum; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity (i.e., the teacher rarely deviates from the materials or vendor-recommended activities, such as lesson content or pacing).	Both conditions are met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of the core curriculum; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity (i.e., the teacher rarely deviates from the materials or vendor-recommended activities, such as lesson content or pacing).
Articulation of Teaching and Learning (in and across grade levels)	Neither condition is met: (1) Teaching and learning is well articulated from one grade to another; (2) teaching and learning is well articulated within grade levels so that students have highly similar experiences, regardless of their assigned teacher.	Only one condition is met: (1) Teaching and learning is well articulated from one grade to another; (2) teaching and learning is well articulated within grade levels so that students have highly similar experiences, regardless of their assigned teacher.	Both conditions are met: (1) Teaching and learning is well articulated from one grade to another; (2) teaching and learning is well articulated within grade levels so that students have highly similar experiences, regardless of their assigned teacher.
Instruction	Neither condition is met: (1) Most or all teachers differentiate instruction; (2) teachers use students' assessment data to identify the needs of students.	Only one condition is met: (1) Most or all teachers differentiate instruction; (2) teachers use students' assessment data to identify the needs of students.	Both conditions are met: (1) Most or all teachers differentiate instruction; (2) teachers use students' assessment data to identify the needs of students.
School-Based Professional Development	The school has no well-defined, school-based professional development mechanism to support continuous improvement of instructional practice.	Some forms of professional development are available to teachers to support continuous improvement of instructional practice, but most are not school-based and do not establish a mechanism to continuously improve instructional practice.	School-based professional development is institutionalized and structured so that all teachers continuously examine, reflect upon, and improve instructional practice.

Item	1	3	5
Secondary Level Prevention			
Evidence-Based Intervention	The secondary level interventions are not evidence-based.	The secondary level interventions consist of a variety of strategies, of which only some are evidence-based and some are not.	All secondary level interventions are evidence-based.
Complements Core Instruction	Secondary level prevention is poorly aligned with core instruction and incorporates different topics, even though those topics are not foundational skills that support core instruction.	Secondary level prevention is generally aligned with core instruction but only occasionally incorporates foundational skills that support core instruction.	Secondary level prevention is well aligned with core instruction and incorporates foundational skills that support core instruction.
Fidelity	Neither condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of secondary level interventions; (2) secondary level implementation is generally implemented with fidelity in accordance with developer guidelines.	Only one condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of secondary level interventions; (2) secondary level implementation is generally implemented with fidelity in accordance with developer guidelines.	Both conditions are met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of secondary level interventions; (2) secondary level implementation is generally implemented with fidelity in accordance with developer guidelines.
Instruction	Neither condition is met: (1) Secondary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.	Only one condition is met: (1) Secondary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.	Both conditions are met: (1) Secondary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.
Determining Responsiveness to Secondary Level Prevention	Neither condition is met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of secondary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.	Only one condition is met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of secondary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.	Both conditions are met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of secondary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.
Addition to Primary	Secondary level interventions replace core instruction.	Secondary level interventions sometimes supplement core instruction and sometimes replace core instruction.	Secondary level interventions supplement core instruction.

Item	1	3	5
Tertiary Level Prevention			
Evidence-Based Intervention	Neither condition is met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are evidence-based standard protocols or based on validated progress monitoring methods for individualizing instruction; (2) tertiary interventions are more intensive than secondary interventions.	Only one condition is met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are evidence-based standard protocols or based on validated progress monitoring methods for individualizing instruction; (2) tertiary interventions are more intensive than secondary interventions.	Both conditions are met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are evidence-based standard protocols or based on validated progress monitoring methods for individualizing instruction; (2) tertiary interventions are more intensive than secondary interventions.
Fidelity	Neither condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of tertiary level interventions; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity.	Only one condition is met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of tertiary level interventions; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity.	Both conditions are met: (1) Procedures are in place to monitor the fidelity of implementation of tertiary level interventions; (2) the preponderance of evidence supports fidelity.
Instruction	Neither condition is met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.	Only one condition is met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.	Both conditions are met: (1) Tertiary level interventions are led by well-trained staff; (2) group size is optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of students.
Determining Responsiveness to Tertiary Level Prevention	Neither condition is met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of tertiary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.	Only one condition is met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of tertiary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.	Both conditions are met: (1) Decisions about responsiveness to intervention are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data to reflect slope of improvement or final status at the end of tertiary level prevention; (2) these decision making criteria are implemented accurately.
Relationship to Primary	Neither condition is met: (1) Decisions regarding student participation in both primary and tertiary levels of prevention are made on a case-by-case basis, according to student need; (2) tertiary level interventions address the general education curriculum in an appropriate manner for students.	Only one condition is met: (1) Decisions regarding student participation in both primary and tertiary levels of prevention are made on a case-by-case basis, according to student need; (2) tertiary level interventions address the general education curriculum in an appropriate manner for students.	Both conditions are met: (1) Decisions regarding student participation in both primary and tertiary levels of prevention are made on a case-by-case basis, according to student need; (2) tertiary level interventions address the general education curriculum in an appropriate manner for students.

Item	1	3	5
Progress Monitoring—*Ongoing and frequent monitoring of progress quantifies rates of improvement and informs instructional practice and the development of individualized programs.*			
Progress Monitoring Tools	Selected progress monitoring tools meet no more than one of the following criteria: (1) Has at least nine alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty; (2) specifies minimum acceptable growth; (3) provides benchmarks for minimum acceptable end-of-year performance; (4) reliability and validity information for the performance level score are available.	Selected progress monitoring tools meet two or three of the following criteria: (1) Has at least nine alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty; (2) specifies minimum acceptable growth; (3) provides benchmarks for minimum acceptable end-of-year performance; (4) reliability and validity information for the performance level score are available.	Selected progress monitoring tools meet all of the following criteria: (1) Has at least nine alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty; (2) specifies minimum acceptable growth; (3) provides benchmarks for minimum acceptable end-of-year performance; (4) reliability and validity information for the performance level score are available.
Monitoring Progress	Neither condition is met: (1) Frequency is at least monthly for students receiving secondary level interventions and at least weekly for students receiving tertiary interventions; (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., appropriate students are tested; scores are accurate; decision making rules are applied consistently).	Only one condition is met: (1) Frequency is at least monthly for students receiving secondary level interventions and at least weekly for students receiving tertiary interventions; (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., appropriate students are tested; scores are accurate; decision making rules are applied consistently).	Both conditions are met: (1) Frequency is at least monthly for students receiving secondary level interventions and at least weekly for students receiving tertiary interventions; (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., appropriate students are tested; scores are accurate; decision making rules are applied consistently).
Data-Based Decision Making—*Data-based decision making processes are used to inform instruction, movement within the multi-level system, and disability identification (in accordance with state law).*			
Decision making Process	The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the prevention levels meets no more than one of the following criteria: the process (1) is data-driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; (3) is operationalized with objective criteria.	The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the prevention levels meets two of these criteria: the process (1) is data-driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; (3) is operationalized with objective criteria.	The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the prevention levels meets all of these criteria: the process (1) is data-driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; (3) is operationalized with objective criteria.

Item	1	3	5
Overarching Factors—*Factors that relate to the entire RTI framework.*			
Prevention Focus	Staff perceive RTI as a pre-referral process that students must complete in order to be referred to special education.	Differences are noted among staff regarding their understanding of the purpose of RTI.	Staff believe that the primary purpose of RTI is to use early interventions as a way to prevent students from having academic and/or behavioral problems.
Leadership	Decisions and actions by school and district leaders undermine the effectiveness of the essential components of the RTI framework at the school.	Decisions and actions by school and district leaders are inconsistent and only somewhat supportive of the essential components of the RTI framework at the school.	Decisions and actions by school and district leaders proactively support the essential components of the RTI framework at the school and make the RTI framework more effective.
Staff Qualifications	Staff responsible for providing secondary and tertiary level interventions have not been adequately trained for their responsibilities.	Some of the staff responsible for providing secondary and tertiary level interventions have been trained, but gaps exist in the professional development of some staff or in their use of the evidence-based interventions.	All of the staff responsible for providing secondary and tertiary level interventions have been fully trained on RTI and on evidence-based interventions, and ongoing professional development is available as needed.
Culturally and Linguistically Responsive	Core instruction and secondary and tertiary interventions do not account for cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic factors.	Core instruction and secondary and tertiary level interventions strive to consider cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic factors, but some areas need improvement.	Core instruction and secondary and tertiary level interventions reflect cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic factors.
Communications With and Involvement of Parents	No conditions are met: (1) A description of the school's essential components of RTI is shared with parents; (2) a coherent mechanism is implemented for updating parents on the progress of their child who is receiving secondary or tertiary interventions; (3) parents are involved during decision -making regarding participation of their child in the prevention levels.	At least one condition is met: (1) A description of the school's essential components of RTI is shared with parents; (2) a coherent mechanism is implemented for updating parents on the progress of their child who is receiving secondary or tertiary interventions; (3) parents are involved during decision making regarding participation of their child in the prevention levels.	All conditions are met: (1) A description of the school's essential components of RTI is shared with parents; (2) a coherent mechanism is implemented for updating parents on the progress of their child who is receiving secondary or tertiary interventions; (3) parents are involved during decision making regarding participation of their child in the prevention levels.

This document was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant No. H326E070004 to the American Institutes for Research, with the assistance of RMC Research Corporation. Grace Zamora Durán and Tina Diamond served as the OSEP project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or polices of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred. This product is public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes, is granted. Any commercial use of the tool is expressly prohibited. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: National Center on Response to Intervention (August 2011). RTI Essential Components Integrity Rubric. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention.

© 2011 American Institutes for Research
All Rights Reserved